

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,453	11/17/2000	James M. Dunn	6169-134	5681

7590 08/13/2004

Gregory A Nelson
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue
Fourth Floor PO Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/715,453

Applicant(s)

DUNN ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-31 and 53-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 and 32-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

FINAL ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 06/09/2004. This action has been made final.

Claims 1-52 are presented for examination. In amendment A, filed on 06/09/2004: claims 22 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 13, 16, 18, 20, 22-26, 32-34, 37-40, 44, 47, 49, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Unger et al. (hereinafter Unger), US 6,230,168.

4. As per claims 1 and 32, Unger teaches a hypermedia content presentation method comprising:

presenting hypermedia content, said hypermedia content containing hyperlinks to additional hypermedia content (Col. 1, lines 50-54; Col. 2, lines 10-13);

storing selected ones of said hyperlinks in a delayed viewing list (Col. 1, lines 50-54; Col. 2, lines 10-13); and

caching hypermedia content associated with said stored hyperlinks during said presenting step (Col. 2, lines 10-13; Col. 4, lines 18-29; Col. 7, lines 62-67).

Art Unit: 2154

5. As per claims 2 and 33, Unger teaches the method of claim 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising reconfiguring said stored hyperlinks to point to said cached hypermedia content (Col. 6, line 65 – Col. 7, line 1; Col. 7, lines 47-51).

6. As per claims 3 and 34, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said presenting step comprises displaying Web content in a Web browser, said Web content containing hyperlinks to additional Web content (Col. 1, lines 55-56).

7. As per claims 6 and 37, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said caching step comprises caching hypermedia content in a server communicatively linked to said content browser (Col. 12, lines 6-10).

8. As per claims 7 and 38, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said caching step comprises caching hypermedia content in a local cache communicatively linked to said content browser (Col. 12, lines 6-10).

9. As per claims 8 and 39, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said caching step comprises:

evaluating available system resources; and

based upon said evaluation, caching said further hypermedia content in a proxy cache where downloading said further hypermedia content to a local cache can constrain local resources (Col. 16, lines 36-42, lines 54-67).

10. As per claims 9 and 40, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said caching step comprises:

evaluating available system resources; and,

based upon said evaluation, downloading said hypermedia content associated with said stored hyperlinks to a hypermedia content cache when said system resources are available, and delaying said downloading when said system resources are constrained (Col. 16, lines 36-42, lines 54-67).

11. As per claims 13 and 44, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising adapting said cached hypermedia content for full text searching in a full text search engine (Col. 1, lines 56-65).

12. As per claims 16 and 47, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising manually managing selected hyperlinks in said delayed viewing list (Col. 4, lines 18-29).

13. As per claims 18 and 49, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising:

selecting hyperlinks in said delayed viewing list (Col. 4, lines 18-30); and

presenting cached hypermedia content associated with said selected hyperlink (Col. 7, lines 47-50; Col. 7, lines 62-67; Col. 15, lines 48-57).

14. As per claims 20 and 51, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising manually managing said cached hypermedia content (Col. 6, lines 65-67; Col. 7, lines 47-51).

15. As per claim 22, Unger teaches a hypermedia content presentation system comprising:

a content browser for presenting hypermedia content to a user;

a content cache for storing further hypermedia content related to said hypermedia content presented in said content browser (Col. 2, lines 10-16);

a delayed viewing list for storing hyperlinks to said further hypermedia content in said content cache, said hyperlinks contained in said hypermedia content presented in said content browser (Col. 1, lines 50-54); and

a delayed viewing list manager;

said delayed viewing list manager downloading said further hypermedia content to said content cache during said presentation of said hypermedia content in said content browser (Col. 15, lines 47-57; Col. 16, lines 36-41, lines 54-67).

16. As per claim 23, Unger teaches the hypermedia content presentation system of claim 22, wherein said content browser is a Web browser and said hypermedia content is Web content (Col. 4, lines 18-29).

17. As per claim 24, Unger teaches the hypermedia content presentation system of claim 22, wherein said content cache is a local cache associated with said content browser (Col. 12, lines 7-10).

18. As per claim 25, Unger teaches the hypermedia content presentation system of claim 22, wherein said content cache is a proxy cache communicatively linked to said content browser (Col. 12, lines 7-10).

19. As per claim 26, Unger teaches the hypermedia content presentation system of claim 22, wherein said delayed viewing list manager further comprises:

a resource sensitive downloading agent;

said resource sensitive downloading agent monitoring available system resources;

said resource sensitive downloading agent downloading said further hypermedia content to said content cache when system resources are available;

said resource sensitive downloading agent delaying said downloading when said system resources are constrained (Col. 16, lines 35-42, lines 54-67).

20. As per claims 4 and 35, Unger teaches the method of claim 3 and 34 respectively, wherein said

Art Unit: 2154

presenting step further comprises playing back multimedia content in a multimedia content player (Col. 14, lines 1-18).

21. As per claim 19 and 50, Unger teaches method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising:

selecting hyperlinks in said delayed viewing list; and,

adding said selected hyperlinks to a list of bookmarks in a content browser (Col. 6, lines 60-67; Col. 7, lines 1-25).

22. As per claims 10 and 41, Unger teaches the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said caching step comprises:

configuring a page depth to which said hyperlinks in said hypermedia content associated with said stored hyperlinks can be followed;

downloading said hypermedia content associated with said stored hyperlinks, said downloaded hypermedia content containing additional hyperlinks to further hypermedia documents (Col. 7, lines 1-25);

further downloading said further hypermedia documents, said further hypermedia documents containing further hyperlinks to even further hypermedia documents; and,

repeating said further downloading step until reaching said configured page depth (Col. 7, lines 1-25; Col. 5, lines 1-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

Art Unit: 2154

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. Claims 5, 10-11, 36, 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger et al. (hereinafter Unger) in view of Stern, US 6,486,892.

25. As per claim 5 and 36, Unger does not explicitly teach the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said presenting step comprises displaying audiovisual television content combined with hypermedia content in a television set.

26. Stern teaches wherein said presenting step comprises displaying audiovisual television content combined with hypermedia content in a television set (Col. 3, lines 2-4).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Unger and Stern because they both dealing with storing of links and files for user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of Stern to allow wherein said presenting step comprises displaying audiovisual television content combined with hypermedia content in a television set would improve the functionality for Unger's system by extending the similar offline options into television network as well.

28. As per claims 11 and 42, Unger does not explicitly teach the method of claims 10 and 41 respectively, further comprising reconfiguring said stored, further and additional hyperlinks to point to associated hypermedia documents stored in said cache.

29. Stern teaches the method of further comprising reconfiguring said stored, further and additional hyperlinks to point to associated hypermedia documents stored in said cache (Col. 6, lines 53-63).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Unger and Stern because they both dealing with storing of links and files for

user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of Stern to allow wherein the method of further comprising reconfiguring said stored, further and additional hyperlinks to point to associated hypermedia documents stored in said cache would improve the functionality and efficiency for Unger's system by allowing the client having the option of viewing all previously downloaded files with the minimum access time.

31. Claims 12, 14-15, 17, 21 43, 45-46, 48, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger et al. (hereinafter Unger) in view of kee<p>oint, hereinafter keepoint.

32. As per claims 12 and 43, Unger does not explicitly teach the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said caching step further comprises:

establishing a set of folders having an associated topic; and,

downloading said hypermedia content to selected ones of said set of folders, each folder in said set containing hypermedia content corresponding to a topic associated with said folder.

33. Keepoint teaches wherein said caching step further comprises:

establishing a set of folders having an associated topic; and,

downloading said hypermedia content to selected ones of said set of folders, each folder in said set containing hypermedia content corresponding to a topic associated with said folder (pg 4, "Automatic Organization", lines 1-5).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Unger and keepoint because they both dealing with storing of links and files for user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of keepoint to allow establishing a set of folders having an associated topic; and downloading said hypermedia content to selected ones of said set of folders, each folder in said set containing hypermedia content

corresponding to a topic associated with said folder would improve the organization for Unger's system by allowing the folders to divide and sort out different hypermedia contents.

35. As per claims 14 and 45, Unger does not explicitly teach the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, wherein said storing step further comprises:

associating expiration data with each hyperlink in said delayed viewing list; and,
purging hyperlinks from said delayed viewing list based on said expiration data.

36. Keepoint teaches wherein said storing step further comprises:

associating expiration data with each hyperlink in said delayed viewing list; and,
purging hyperlinks from said delayed viewing list based on said expiration data (pg 4, "Keeping Web Pages on Hold", lines 1-6).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Unger and keepoint because they both dealing with storing of links and files for user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of keepoint to allow associating expiration data with each hyperlink in said delayed viewing list; and, purging hyperlinks from said delayed viewing list based on said expiration data would improve functionality for Unger's system by allowing the clients to view hypermedia contents beyond their expiration dates.

38. As per claims 15 and 46 , Unger does not explicitly teach the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising purging selected cached hypermedia content. .

39. Keepoint teaches purging selected cached hypermedia content (pg 4, "Keeping Web Pages on Hold", lines 1-6).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made

to combine the teaching of Unger and keepoint because they both dealing with storing of links and files for user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of keepoint to allow purging selected cached hypermedia content would improve efficiency for Unger's system by allowing the cache to be reused once the data from the cache are purged.

41. As per claims 17 and 48, Unger does not teach the method of claims 1 and 32 respectively, further comprising automatically purging selected hyperlinks in said delayed viewing list.

42. Keepoint teaches automatically purging selected hyperlinks in said delayed viewing list (pg 4, "Automatic Organization", lines 1-6).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Unger and keepoint because they both dealing with storing of links and files for user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of keepoint to allow automatically purging selected hyperlinks in said delayed viewing list would improve efficiency for Unger's system by allowing the link cache to be reused once the data from the links from the link cache are purged.

44. As per claims 21 and 52, Unger does not teach the method of claim 1, wherein said caching step comprises:

determining if a selected hyperlink is associated with hypermedia content having a limited lifetime;
if it is determined that a selected hyperlink is associated with hypermedia content having a limited lifetime, identifying further hypermedia content necessary for viewing said hypermedia content having a limited lifetime, and downloading said hypermedia content having a limited lifetime and said necessary further hypermedia content.

Art Unit: 2154

45. Keepoint teaches wherein said caching step comprises:

determining if a selected hyperlink is associated with hypermedia content having a limited lifetime;
if it is determined that a selected hyperlink is associated with hypermedia content having a limited lifetime, identifying further hypermedia content necessary for viewing said hypermedia content having a limited lifetime, and downloading said hypermedia content having a limited lifetime and said necessary further hypermedia content (pg 4, "Keeping Web Pages on Hold", lines 1-6).

46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Unger and keepoint because they both dealing with storing of links and files for user access at a later point in time (i.e. offline browsing). Furthermore, the teaching of keepoint to allow determining if a selected hyperlink is associated with hypermedia content having a limited lifetime; if it is determined that a selected hyperlink is associated with hypermedia content having a limited lifetime, identifying further hypermedia content necessary for viewing said hypermedia content having a limited lifetime, and downloading said hypermedia content having a limited lifetime and said necessary further hypermedia content would improve functionality for Unger's system by allowing the client to have the ability to view hypermedia contents beyond their usual limited life time.

Conclusion

47. Applicant's remarks filed 6/09/04 have been considered but are found not persuasive.

48. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Unger fails to show the step of presenting hypermedia content, such as the presentation of content 142 within the content browser 111.

In response to applicant's amendment, Unger does teach the above limitation.

Referring to Col. 6, lines 65-67; Col. 7, lines 52-60 along with previously cited examples teaches the links being displayed within content browsers, subsequently Unger teaches this limitation.

49. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Unger does not permit the selection of hyperlinks within presented hypermedia content.

In response to applicant's amendment, Unger does teach the above limitation.

Referring to Col. 4, lines 18-29, Unger explicitly point out that user selecting the hyperlinks; next referring to Col. 3, lines 15-40, Unger stated URL aspect of hyperlinks, the browser and user interaction with both technologies; furthermore, user may click/select on hyperlinks within web-pages as a part of selection process, this is obvious and well known in the art. Thus Unger teaches user selection of hypermedia content while presenting.

50. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Unger does not teach caching of hypermedia content associated with said stored hyperlinks during said presenting step.

In response to applicant's amendment, Unger does teach the above limitation.

Referring to Col. 11, lines 52-67; Col. 12, lines 5-10; Col. 13, lines 13-16, and Col. 14, lines 1-18, Unger teaches the notion of cache and caching while presenting media to the end user. Thus, Unger teaches the above limitation.

51. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Unger fails to include a delayed viewing list or any equivalent structure.

In response to applicant's amendment, Unger does teach the above limitation.

Referring to Col. 16, lines 35-42, and Col. 16, lines 54-67; the delayed viewing list is pre-fetched in accordance with explicitly request information (i.e. user selection of hyperlink). Thus proves that this list is dynamically generated based upon user selection. Furthermore, the size of the list is also dynamically adjustable in accordance with the bandwidth availability. Thus, Unger does teach the above limitation.

Art Unit: 2154

52. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Unger fails to indicate that members of a target audience should be permitted to make modification to the collection.

In response to applicant's amendment, Unger does teach the above limitation.

Referring to Col. 6, lines 65-67, users have the ability to make changes through an editor, thus Unger teaches the above limitation.

53. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that there is no way for the applicant to know whether Keepoint existed upon the filing date of the present application.

In response to applicant's amendment, the date of the Keepoint's reference is included within the first IDS, more specifically, the Keepoint reference is actually dated 10/27/2000, the 2004 date is the date which the document was printed. Thus the correct date for Keepoint is know in advance.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

54. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "User Specified Parallel Data Fetching For Optimized Web Access".


- i. US 6,199,071 Nielsen.
- ii. WO 00/55741 Siegel.
- iii. EP 0987639 Moreau.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
August 2, 2004


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100